UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 2 OAKLAND DIVISION 3 RODERICK HERBERT, No. C 06-05532 SBA 4 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 5 [Docket Nos. 82, 87] 6 STATE FARM MUTUAL 7 **AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE** COMPANY and DOES 1-20, inclusive, 8 Defendants. 9 10 11 This Court granted judgment for defendant State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance 12 Company on February 14, 2008. See Docket No. 77. Plaintiff Roderick Herbert filed a Notice of 13 Appeal on April 2, 2008, see Docket No. 81, after his 30-day deadline to do so under Federal Rule 14 of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(1)(A) had passed. On this same day, Herbert filed Motion for 15 Extension of Time to File Notice of Appeal (the "Motion for Extension"), see Docket No. 83, and 16 Motion to Shorten Time for Briefing, Hearing and Determination of the Motion for Extension (the 17 "Motion to Shorten Time"), see Docket No. 82. On April 8, 2008, State Farm filed a Response 18 regarding the Motion to Shorten Time, see Docket No. 88. For the following reasons, the Court 19 denies the Motion to Shorten Time as Moot. 20 Northern District Civil Local Rule 6-1 provides, in part: 21 6-3. Motion to Change Time. 22 (a) Form and Content. A motion to enlarge or shorten time may be no more 23 than 5 pages in length and must be accompanied by a proposed order and by a 24 declaration that: 25 (c) Opposition to Motion to Change Time. Unless otherwise ordered, a party 26 27 Herbert, however, failed to E-file these pleadings. Herbert is ordered to comply with the Clerk's Notice dated April 3, 2008, see Docket No. 87, within three court days of the date of this 28 Order.

who opposes a motion to enlarge or shorten time must file an opposition not to exceed 5 pages, accompanied by a declaration setting forth the basis for opposition, no later than the third court day after receiving the motion....

(d) Action by the Court. After receiving a motion to enlarge or shorten time and any opposition, the Judge may grant, deny, modify the requested time change or schedule the matter for additional briefing or a hearing.

N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 6-1.

In this case, the Court has not set a hearing on Roderick's Motion for Extension. Thus there is no hearing time to shorten. Despite State Farm's non-opposition, the Court denies the Motion to Shorten Time as moot. The Court notes, however, in its statement of non-opposition, State Farm did request an opportunity to respond to the Motion for Extension. Although it should have filed a response, under Civil Local Rule 6-1(d), without waiting for leave from the Court, the Court nonetheless grants it three Court days from the date of this Order to file a response, under Civil Local Rule 6-1(d). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(a)(2) shall not apply to this briefing schedule. Herbert shall not file any reply. Unless the Court notifies the parties otherwise, no hearing will be set for the Motion, as the Court will consider the matter submitted on the pleadings, when State Farm's response is filed.

CONCLUSION

The Court DENIES plaintiff Roderick Herbert's Motion to Shorten Time for Briefing, Hearing and Determination of Motion to Extend Time to File a Notice of Appeal [Docket No. 82] as Moot. State Farm has three court days from the date of this Order to file a response, as discussed above. Lastly, Herbert shall comply with the Clerk's Notice dated April 3, 2008 [Docket No. 87], within three court days of the date of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

May 15, 2008

Saundra Brown Armstrong United States District Judge

Saundra B grosstra